Social Progress

HOLBROOK LIBRARY
PACIFIC SCHOOL
OF RELIGION

People everywhere today are troubled by the threat of war which in this atomic age would be a calamity of unspeakable terror and tragedy. People everywhere want lasting peace.

By peace we do not mean merely the absence of war. Neither do we think of peace in terms of great powers and power groupings poised in perpetual antagonism. Our concept of peace must be dynamic—peaceful competition with growing co-operation, which is more than "coexistence."

—General Assembly Pronouncements, 1955

The Road to Peace

MARCH 1956

Vol. XLVI, No. 7

Social Progress

Published by the Department of Social Education and Action of the Board of Christian Education of the Presbyterian Church, U.S.A., to provide a forum for the Church on subjects of social concern for Christians. It includes program resources, legislative developments, and guides to worship, study, and action for leaders of social action groups in local churches, presbyteries, synods, presbyterial and synodical societies. Articles represent the opinions of the authors—not the official policy of the Department of Social Education and Action or of the Presbyterian Church in the U.S.A.

CONTENTS: March, 1956

From This Vantage Point 3

Sections

I. The Scourge of War 5
II. The Road to Peace 10
III. American Foreign Policy 13
IV. Ethical Implications 20
V. World Government—Pro and Con 24
VI. What Can You Do? 27
VII. World Order in Your Church—How to Get Started ... 29

The Announcer ..... Back Cover

Department of Social Education and Action: Clifford Earle, Margaret E. Kuhn, H. B. Sissel, Gayraud Wilmore; Helen H. Harder (Editorial Assistant), Helen Lineweaver (Director of Washington Office). Editorial correspondence should be addressed to Clifford Earle, Secretary and Editor.

Counseling Committee on Social Education and Action: Joseph J. Copeland, Mrs. Edward Fisher, Arthur W. Mielke, Henry Lee Willet, Frank T. Wilson, Chairman, Paul S. Wright; Mrs. Roland P. Beattie, Richard Pacini, Shelby Rooks; Walter H. Eastwood, John A. Mackay; Emery Bacon, Mrs. Werner J. Blanchard, C. Elwood Boulware, Herbert N. Brockway, William Adams Brown, Jr., Burton Fowler, Paul K. Justus, Paul Lehmann, Franc L. McCluer, Mrs. Harold R. Tolliver, Edmund S. Wolfe, and Willem F. Zuurdeeg.

Published monthly, except August, by the Department of Social Education and Action of the Board of Christian Education of the Presbyterian Church in the United States of America, at 1009 Sloan St., Crawfordsville, Indiana. Entered as second-class matter at the post office at Crawfordsville, Indiana, under the act of March 3, 1879.

Editorial and Executive office, 830 Witherspoon Building, Philadelphia 7, Pa.

Subscriptions, $1.00 a year; three years for $2.50. Single copy, 15 cents. Group rates on request. Send subscriptions to 830 Witherspoon Building, Philadelphia 7, Pa.

Copyright, 1956, by the Board of Christian Education of the Presbyterian Church in the United States of America.

From This Vantage Point...

THE THINGS THAT MAKE FOR PEACE

WOULD that even today you knew the things that make for peace!" (Luke 19:42.) Implied in these words is a plea for realism. When the issues are as great as they are in international relations (life or death, freedom or bondage, for vast numbers of persons) it is immoral to be impractical. For example, some advocates of world government *now* are making proposals regarding UN Charter revisions which, if seriously urged on the diplomatic level, would grievously divide and probably wreck the United Nations. A recent article by Rodney Shaw in *The Christian Century* was so naïve on the subject of UN Charter changes as to be downright dangerous.

It is commonly said that two "massive realities" dominate international affairs today. One is the conflict between an aggressive Soviet Communism and the non-Soviet world, presently in a state of cold peace, a difficult and dangerous situation where relations should be characterized not by daring, but by infinite care and caution. The other is the revolutionary upheaval in vast areas of the world compounded of a passionate nationalism in rebellion against every form of domination, a revolt against hunger and misery, and a resentment against racial arrogance on the part of the dominant peoples of the West.

We would like to suggest that a third reality is very much to be taken into account—a rising tide of good will, a growing determination among the common peoples of all the nations to achieve a just and lasting peace. Back of this desire for peace is not so much fear as the conviction that war today would be total and that total war would bring the solution of nothing and the ruin of everything.

What is the role of the churches in the search for world peace and order? Is it not to shed the light of God upon the acts of men as they affect international relations?

Let the churches be as specific and realistic as possible in affirming "the things that make for peace," in encouraging our Government to perform acts of unadulterated international good will, in giving support to men in public life whose influence is very definitely on the side of international understanding and co-operation, in helping church members to be "peacemakers."

In an election year it is important for church members not only to affirm the high goal of "a just and durable peace," but also to support candidates for public office, particularly candidates for seats in the Senate and in the House of Representatives, who support policies that truly lead to peace, the kind of peace that is consonant with man's dignity and with his need to be free. Church members are often very gullible and careless when it comes to politics. They say they believe in and desire the peace of the world, but at the same time they have been known to give fanatical support to men and to party factions whose policies really and practically are opposed to peace.

We present the following selections in the hope that they will help you to understand better "the things that make for peace."

—The SEA Staff

The books from which these selections have been taken would make a valuable contribution to any church library. It is hoped that readers of this issue of SOCIAL PROGRESS will see the value of procuring one or more of these volumes.

I

The Scourge of War

THE WILL of God prevails. In great contests each party claims to act in accordance with the will of God. Both may be, and one must be, wrong. God cannot be for and against the same thing at the same time. In the present civil war it is quite possible that God's purpose is something different from the purpose of either party; and yet the human instrumentalities, working just as they do, are of the best adaptation to effect his purpose. I am almost ready to say that this is probably true; that God wills this contest, and wills that it shall not end yet. By his mere great power on the minds of the now contestants, he could have either saved or destroyed the Union without a human contest. Yet the contest began. And, having begun, he could give the final victory to either side any day. Yet the contest proceeds. [*Abraham Lincoln, September, 1862.*]

•

At this second appearing to take the oath of the Presidential office, there is less occasion for an extended address than there was at the first. Then a statement, somewhat in detail, of a course to be pursued, seemed fitting and proper. Now, at the expiration of four years, during which public declarations have been constantly called forth on every point and phase of the great contest which still absorbs the attention, and engrosses the energies of the nation, little that is new could be presented. The progress of our arms, upon which all else chiefly depends, is as well known to the public as to myself; and it is, I trust, reasonably satisfactory and encouraging to all. With high hope for the future, no prediction in regard to it is ventured.

On the occasion corresponding to this four years ago, all thoughts were anxiously directed to an impending civil war. All dreaded it—all sought to avert it. While the inaugural address was being delivered from this place, devoted altogether to saving the Union without war, insurgent agents were in the city seeking to *destroy* it without war—seeking to dissolve the Union, and divide effects, by negotiation. Both parties deprecated war; but one would *make* war rather than let the nation survive; and the other *accept* war rather than

let it perish. And the war came.

One eighth of the whole population were colored slaves, not distributed generally over the Union, but localized in the Southern part of it. These slaves constituted a peculiar and powerful interest. All knew that this interest was, somehow, the cause of the war. To strengthen, perpetuate, and extend this interest was the object for which the insurgents would rend the Union, even by war; while the government claimed no right to do more than to restrict the territorial enlargement of it. Neither party expected for the war the magnitude, or the duration, which it has already attained. Neither anticipated that the *cause* of the conflict might cease with, or even before, the conflict itself should cease. Each looked for an easier triumph, and a result less fundamental and astounding. Both read the same Bible, and pray to the same God; and each invokes His aid against the other. It may seem strange that any men should dare to ask a just God's assistance in wringing their bread from the sweat of other men's faces; but let us judge not that we be not judged. The prayers of both could not be answered; that of neither has been answered fully.

The Almighty has his own purposes. "Woe unto the world because of offenses! for it must needs be that offenses come; but woe to that man by whom the offense cometh!" If we shall suppose that American slavery is one of those offenses which, in the providence of God, must needs come, but which, having continued through his appointed time, he now wills to remove, and that he gives *to both North and South* this terrible war, as the woe due to *those by whom the offense came*, shall we discern therein any departure from those divine attributes which the believers in a living God always ascribe to him? Fondly do we hope—fervently do we pray—that this mighty scourge of war may speedily pass away. Yet, if God wills that it continue, . . . still it must be said, "The judgments of the Lord are true and righteous altogether."

With malice toward none; with charity for all; with firmness in the right, as God gives us to see the right, let us strive on to finish the work we are in; to bind up the nation's wounds; to care for him who shall have borne the battle, and for his widow, and his orphan—to do all which may achieve and cherish a just and lasting peace, among ourselves, and with all nations. [*Second Inaugural Address, March 4, 1865.*]

—*Abraham Lincoln, from* Readings in World Politics, *Volume Two, edited by Robert A. Goldwin. American Foundation for Political Education, 1953. Used by permission.*

What Is War?

A careful study of human history reveals that the assumption that war is inherent in human nature—and therefore eternal—is shallow and faulty, that it is only a superficial impression. Far from being inexplicable or inevitable, we can invariably determine the situations that predispose to war, and the conditions which lead to war.

The real cause of all wars has always been the same. They have occurred with the mathematical regularity of a natural law at clearly determined moments as the result of clearly definable conditions.

If we try to detect the mechanism visibly in operation, the single cause ever-present at the outbreak of each and every conflict known to human history, if we attempt to reduce the seemingly innumerable causes of war to a common denominator, two clear and unmistakable observations emerge.

1. Wars between groups of men forming social units always take place when these units—tribes, dynasties, Churches, cities, nations—exercise unrestricted sovereign power.
2. Wars between these social units cease the moment sovereign power is transferred from them to a larger or higher unit.

From these observations we can deduce a social law with the characteristics of an axiom that applies to and explains each and every war in the history of all time.

War takes place whenever and wherever nonintegrated social units of equal sovereignty come into contact.

War between given social units of equal sovereignty is the permanent symptom of each successive phase of civilization. Wars always ceased when a higher unit established its own sovereignty, absorbing the sovereignties of the conflicting smaller social groups.

—The Anatomy of Peace, *by Emery Reves. Harper & Brothers, 1945. Used by permission.*

Problems of Interdependence

The development of instruments of communication and transportation did create a potential world community by destroying all the old barriers of time and space. But the new interdependence of the nations created a more perplexing problem than anyone had anticipated. It certainly did not prompt the nations forthwith to organize a "parliament of man and federation of the world." Rather it extended the scope of old international frictions so that a single generation was subjected to two wars of global dimensions. Furthermore the second conflict left the world as far from the goal of global peace as the first. At its conclusion the world's peace was at the mercy of two competing alliances of world savers, the one informed by the bourgeois and the other by the proletarian creed of world redemption. Thus the civil war in the heart of modern industrial nations, which had already brought so much social confusion into the modern world, was re-enacted in the strife between nations. The development of atomic instruments of conflict aggravated the fears not only of those who lacked such instruments, but of those who had them. The fears of the latter added a final ironic touch to the whole destiny of modern man. The possession of power has never annulled the fears of those who wield it, since it prompts them to anxiety over its possible loss. The possession of a phenomenal form of destructive power in the modern day has proved to be so fruitful

of new fears that the perennial ambiguity of man's situation of power and weakness became more vividly exemplified, rather than overcome. Thus a century which was meant to achieve a democratic society of world scope finds itself at its halfway mark uncertain about the possibility of avoiding a new conflict of such proportions as to leave the survival of mankind, or at least the survival of civilization, in doubt.

—From Faith and History, *by Reinhold Niebuhr. Charles Scribner's Sons, 1949. Used by permission.*

War's New Meaning

In the nineteenth century international law, war was a legal condition which equally permitted two or more hostile groups to carry on a conflict by armed force. War was not an outbreak of lawlessness, but a condition or institution which the law defined and regulated, and which permitted the participants to utilize armed force against one another. The most significant characteristic, however, was the equality of the parties. Third states were bound, unless they became belligerent, to treat the two sides of the conflict alike. While "benevolent" and "unfriendly" neutrality were given a certain recognition in the juristic writings and practices of the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, nineteenth century international law, prompted in no small measure by the attitude taken by the United States in the 1790's, and formally codified in the Hague Conventions of 1907, held that neutrals must be impartial except in so far as they could justify discriminations or reprisals because of injuries resulting from illegal behavior by one of the belligerents. Thus the concept of neutrality defined the concept of war. The essence of war was the equality of the belligerents. Obviously, with this concept of war, discussion of the policies which the belligerents were seeking to promote or the circumstances under which the war originated were irrelevant to any legal consideration of the rights and duties of states, whether belligerent or neutral. War was a duel the results of which determined the justice of the claims of the participants.

The change in the concept of war is to be seen in the legal elimination of the duties of neutrality, first those of abstention and then those of impartiality. The process began in the Hague Convention of 1899, which recognized that all states had an interest in "obviating recourse to force" and that therefore states should "use their best efforts to insure the pacific settlement of international difficulties." States not party to a dispute were urged "on their own initiative" to tender their good offices or mediation to potential or actual belligerents. Such action was not obligatory, nor were the disputing states bound to accept the offer. Third states were not authorized to intervene in the technical sense of dictatorial interference, but there was a general recognition that every state had an interest in every war or threat of war. War had ceased to be

a duel in which only the combatants were interested. . . .

The United Nations Charter made the obsolescence of the nineteenth century concepts of war and neutrality even more clear. The major purpose of the United Nations is "to maintain international peace and security, and to that end, to take effective collective measures for the prevention and removal of threats to the peace, and for the suppression of acts of aggression or other breaches of the peace" (Art. 1). Members of the United Nations are bound "to settle their international disputes by peaceful means" and to "refrain in their international relations from the threat or use of force against the territorial integrity or political independence of any state, or in any other manner inconsistent with the purposes of the United Nations." Furthermore, members are bound to assist the United Nations "in action it takes in accordance with the Charter." . . .

If these commitments are taken at their face value, war and neutrality no longer exist as legal institutions. A state that resorts to armed force is either an aggressor who should be suppressed, a defender who should be assisted, or a participant in international sanctions permitted or authorized by the United Nations. All members of the United Nations are bound by the Charter to regulate their action by these distinctions, not by the traditional concept of states of war and neutrality.

—*Quincy Wright, from* Measure, *Spring, 1951. Used by permission of Henry Regnery Company. Reprinted in* Readings in World Politics, *Vol. II, American Foundation for Political Education, 1953.*

Man's Self-Mutilation

The problem of world peace, for instance, in contradistinction to the problem of the air-cooled engine, is not closer to solution today than it was when it first presented itself to the human mind. In contrast to less scientific periods of history, we have today all the facts concerning war and peace. More books have been written and more intellectual energy has been spent on the problem of international peace during the last hundred years than in all previous history. Yet neither thought nor action has progressed beyond its primitive beginnings thousands of years ago. The human forces which gave rise to the problem then in the form of armed conflicts of human collectivities are still at work today engendering the same results and posing the same problems. What has changed in the process of history are the techniques of warfare and, perhaps, the rationalizations and justifications but not the thing itself, that is, the murderous conflagration of human collectivities through which the individual egotisms and aggressive instincts find vicarious and morally expedient satisfaction.

—*From* Scientific Man vs. Power Politics, *by Hans J. Morgenthau.* Copyright, 1946, by *the University of Chicago Press. Used by permission.*

II

The Road to Peace

In the crisis of world history in which we stand, we have a particularly vivid example of the twofold character of all historic political tasks and achievements. The economic interdependence of the world places us under the obligation, and gives us the possibility, of enlarging the human community so that the principle of order and justice will govern the international as well as the national community. We are driven to this new task by the lash of fear as well as by the incitement of hope. For our civilization is undone if we cannot overcome the anarchy in which the nations live. This new and compelling task represents the positive side of historical development and reveals the indeterminate possibilities of good in history.

Unfortunately, however, many of the idealists who envisage this new responsibility think they can fulfill it best by denying the perennial problems of the political order. They think that world government is possible without an implied hegemony of the stronger powers. This hegemony is inevitable; and so is the peril of a new imperialism, which is inherent in it. The peril can best be overcome by arming all nations great and small with constitutional power to resist the exactions of dominant power. This is to say that the principle of the balance of power is implied in the idea of constitutional justice. But if the central and organizing principle of power is feared too much, and the central authority is weakened, then the political equilibrium degenerates once more to an unorganized balance of power. And an unorganized balance of power is potential anarchy.

Thus we face all the old problems of political organization on the new level of a potential international community. The new international community will be constructed neither by the pessimists, who believe it impossible to go beyond the balance of power principle in the relation of nations to each other; nor by the cynics, who would organize the world by the imposition of imperial authority without regard to the injustices which flow inevitably from arbitrary and irresponsible power; nor yet by the idealists, who are under the fond illusion that . . . historic development will emancipate history of these vexing problems.

The new world must be built by resolute men who "when hope is dead will hope by faith"; who will neither seek premature escape from the guilt of history, nor yet call the evil, which taints all their achievements, good. There is no escape from the paradoxical relation of history to the Kingdom of God. History moves towards the realization of the Kingdom but yet the judgment of God is upon every new realization.

—*From* The Nature and Destiny of Man, *Vol. II, by Reinhold Niebuhr. Charles Scribner's Sons, 1943. Used by permission.*

Toward an International Ethos

The world of nations desperately needs an international ethos to provide a sound groundwork for the development of international law and institutions. This requires not only attempts to find wider areas of common moral understanding, but also efforts to bring the guiding principles of international life into greater harmony with God's will. Christians should urge statesmen to devote more attention to this fundamental task. In order to do this with authority Christians must be clear on their own understanding of the essential principles. This can be done only by sustained study. Tentatively, we advance the following considerations:

1. All power carries responsibility and all nations are trustees of power which should be used for the common good.

2. All nations are subject to moral law, and should strive to abide by the accepted principles of international law to develop this law and to enforce it through common actions.

3. All nations should honor their pledged word and international agreements into which they have entered.

4. No nation in an international dispute has the right to be sole judge in its own cause or to resort to war to advance its policies, but should seek to settle disputes by direct negotiations or by submitting them to conciliation, arbitration, or judicial settlement.

5. All nations have a moral obligation to ensure universal security and to this end should support measures designed to deny victory to a declared aggressor.

6. All nations should recognize and safeguard the inherent dignity, worth, and essential rights of the human person, without distinction as to race, sex, language, or religion.

7. Each nation should recognize the rights of every other nation, which observes such standards, to live by and proclaim its own political and social beliefs, provided that it does not seek by coercion, threat, in-

filtration, or deception to impose these on other nations.

8. All nations should recognize an obligation to share their scientific and technical skills with peoples in less developed regions, and to help the victims of disaster in other lands.

9. All nations should strive to develop cordial relations with their neighbors, encourage friendly cultural and commercial dealings, and join in creative international efforts for human welfare.

—*From* Evanston Speaks, *Reports of the Second Assembly of the World Council of Churches, 1955. Used by permission.*

UN Charter Preamble

We, the peoples of the United Nations, determined to save succeeding generations from the scourge of war, which twice in our lifetime has brought untold sorrow to mankind, and

to reaffirm faith in fundamental human rights, in the dignity and worth of the human person, in the equal rights of men and women and of nations large and small, and

to establish conditions under which justice and respect for the obligations arising from treaties and other sources of international law can be maintained, and

to promote social progress and better standards of life in larger freedom,

and for these ends to practice tolerance and live together in peace with one another as good neighbors, and

to unite our strength to maintain international peace and security, and

to ensure, by the acceptance of principles and the institution of methods, that armed force shall not be used, save in the common interest, and

to employ international machinery for the promotion of the economic and social advancement of all peoples,

have resolved to combine our efforts to accomplish these aims.

III

American Foreign Policy

AMERICANS generally recognize the characteristics of intrinsic limitation in respect to the state's role in domestic affairs. Here indeed, in their precepts if not so much in their practices, the Americans are virtually singular among the nations for their skepticism about the wisdom and the efficacy of public authority. Americans tend to overlook these limitations—at least, many Americans tend to do so—in their attitudes toward the role of the United States in foreign affairs. In this range their perspectives tend to be thrown off. Americans, said Gertrude Stein, are brought up "to believe in boundlessness." With respect to nothing else is this so manifest as it is with respect to their views as to the inherent capability of the United States Government to avail in matters actually external to its jurisdiction and therefore beyond its control.

I stress the obvious but often overlooked externalness of foreign policy. The fundamental circumstance giving rise to foreign policy is that most of the world is outside the United States. The areas in which our foreign policy has its effects are those lying beyond the range of our law. They include about fifteen sixteenths of the world's land surface and contain about sixteen seventeenths of its peoples. We cannot ordain the conditions there. The forces do not respond to our fiat. At best we can only affect them. We exercise only influence, not the sovereign power to dispose, in those ranges once described by the Supreme Court in a memorable opinion as "this vast external realm, with its important, complicated, delicate, and manifold problems."

I can recall from my own experience dozens of examples of the American tendency to disregard limitation of power precisely with respect to matters beyond the limits of our control.

An exigent lady in the audience in a Midwestern city about three years ago asked me to outline the course of United States foreign policy for the next ten years. I denied having a crystal ball. She reduced to five years the interval concerned in the request. I carefully restated my view of foreign policy as necessarily being in large part a response to situations arising beyond the national jurisdiction and therefore beyond our Government's control and beyond my modest power to predict. She

spurned that answer. She insisted on the predictability of the future in world affairs, given sufficient diligence on the part of those conducting policy. I told her the main surely predictable element of the future was trouble, which was bound to proliferate along our course, though I could not undertake to define all its forms and occasions. The lady answered with scorn for the Department of State for not having worked out a formula for eliminating trouble.

Such ideas abound within as well as outside the Government. I recall, for example, a conference of a couple of years ago between a delegation from another office of the Government and the members of the Policy Planning Staff of the State Department. The visitors wanted to mesh with foreign policy certain plans of their making. They asked us to unroll the secret scrolls of the future—at least for a twenty-year interval of it. They departed in dudgeon, disdain, and disbelief on hearing our disclaimer.

I call to mind being asked by a man in an audience in Texas a few months ago to explain the State Department's failure to foresee the rising clash in interest and purpose between metropolitan France and native elements of French North Africa. I assured him this had been foreseen. Then he asked for an accounting on the United States' failure to prevent it.

In the life of the state as in the life of the individual, problems foreseen may often be beyond the scope of one's power of ordaining. The situation in the conduct of foreign policy often reminds me of the story of the boastful pilot. While steering a ship into port, he remarked to the skipper, "I know every rock in this harbor." A rending contact between ship and reef interrupted him. Then he added, "That's one of them now." I related all this to my questioner in Texas but did not convince him that the fact of a falling out between North African Arabs and France was not due to some remissness in Washington.

A while back a friend of mine, giving me his personal views on how to handle foreign affairs, drew an analogy from his own business, railroad traffic management. He represented the world as a switchyard, the United States as a locomotive, and all the other nations as boxcars. I remarked on the irrelevancy of his account of railroading technics to foreign affairs. The world is not an organized place like a switchyard. Other nations are not inert vehicles like boxcars. They are corporate entities with purposes of their own. Respecting them the United States disposes no monopoly of power like that of a locomotive among boxcars. All this I explained to my friend. He rejoined with a comment about the mulish unwillingness of the members of the State Department to accept from other walks of life the lessons of how to conduct the nation's affairs.

The same notion of the attainability of perfect foresight in the planning and perfect efficacy of the execution of foreign policy is an ingredient in the abundant schemes put forth by well-meaning groups for

a variety of one-shot solutions of the problems of a difficult world. It is reflected also in a way many people have of attributing developments in every quadrant of the globe to some design conceived in Washington.

—*From* The Limits of Foreign Policy, *by Charles Burton Marshall. Henry Holt and Company, 1954. Used by permission.*

A Strong Democracy —An American Imperative

In India I was often asked, "Would America be concerned about our poverty if she were not afraid of our going Communist?" My answer was that I believed we would. I fervently hope I am right.

There is an apocryphal story going the rounds of Asian capitals which by indirection says something which we should take to heart. It seems that when the Prime Minister of the tiny state of Monaco heard about the Marshall Plan he flew to Washington to apply for aid. His modest request was viewed favorably until an official happened to ask, "By the way, how is your Communist problem?"

The Prime Minister replied proudly, "We have no Communists in Monaco. We are a poor but sensible people." Our official was embarrassed and explained reluctantly that if there was no Communist problem it would be nearly impossible to get Congress to vote the necessary funds, however sound the projects. . . .

Here is a point worth remembering. How silly we must sometimes seem reducing every question to the Communist equation. Some of the questions are bigger than Communism. World development, symbolized by the concept of Point Four, is potentially far bigger than Communism. If all the Communists on earth disappeared overnight, the need for foreign aid to assist new struggling peoples to achieve stable democratic societies would still be there.

The challenge is to do what we ought to have done without the Communist challenge. But can we do what needs to be done out of fear or negation? We did not build our own country in order to oppose some foreign ideology but because we had a positive faith of our own. Only in that way can Asians build their new countries, and only in that spirit can our presence be of real assistance.

It is essential that we should ask ourselves some blunt questions about our real objective in extending Point Four aid in Asia and Africa.

Is it to make America popular?

Is it to buy the people's gratitude?

Is it to win allies in the cold war?

Is it to increase the acceptance of capitalism abroad?

Most of these objectives, like stopping Communism, are desirable by themselves, but if we make them the

direct essential goals of our foreign aid I am confident that we will achieve none of them.

As I see it our primary objective is to strengthen democracy in the new free nations of Asia for its own sake, without regard to occasional disagreements with them which are certain to rise. Democracy presupposes disagreements, and it is democracy to which we as a nation are above all committed.

If these new nations are successful in creating governments which are strong, democratic, and solidly supported by their people, we can stop worrying about the spread of Communism in Asia. Then we can surely expect to see many of the other objectives which I have listed achieved as by-products.

If we ask for thanks we will get none. But if we concentrate on the work that needs to be done we will be embarrassed by all the thanks we will get. In Assam, in northeast India, where not a cent of U.S. aid had gone at the time, I was once greeted with floral arches in half a dozen villages, and lavish thanks for several constructive projects which had been started solely from Indian funds. Because we had not stopped to ask for credit for what we did, people assumed that we had done far more than was the case.

—*From* Ambassador's Report, *by Chester Bowles. Harper & Brothers, 1954. Used by permission.*

Enter the Atom

The discoveries of the nuclear physicists have given to the conduct of foreign relations a somberness and hazard which neither domestic nor international politics has ever held before. Both at home and abroad there hangs over all of us the brooding omnipresent possibility that if things go wrong enough in our foreign relations a vast number of us here and elsewhere may be blown to bits and with us a good many of our cities and the industries which support our national lives. Even the nation-states of which we are citizens may not continue in anything like the form in which we now know them.

This is the hazard which rides upon chance or error. This is what gives a tenseness and solemnity to the moves which our statesmen make for us. This is what underlies the necessity for thought, hard thought, and plenty of it, as nothing ever did before.

There is an odd pastime, which we occasionally read about in the newspapers, called Russian roulette. One puts a single cartridge in a revolver, spins the chamber, then puts the muzzle against one's head and

pulls the trigger. If only a click results, one passes the revolver to the next player, who repeats the process. Sooner or later something more than a click results.

It is moderate to say that in this game the hazard risked upon chance is excessive. In our foreign affairs such risks are possible too. It is unwise to take them. The very existence of these risks today is one of the postulates which must enter into and profoundly affect what we do and don't do abroad. . . .

I think it should also be assumed that, if hostilities (I am not referring to isolated patrol or air clashes) should start in Europe or elsewhere, which engaged our own and Soviet forces, atomic attacks on continental United States must be expected. This seems the only safe assumption, both because of the desire of the other side to strike a crippling blow at the center of the opposed military and industrial strength, and also because, if tactical weapons are used, there will be strong pressures to widen the area of attack and counterattack until it ends in strategic bombing. I see no line short of it which under the pressures of war the self-interest of both sides is likely to draw and to maintain.

The conclusion I reach is that war between the Soviet Union and the United States would in all probability bring such devastation and carnage to the two participants, and to other countries as well, that it should be a major purpose of our foreign policy (and theirs as well) to avoid it. By a major purpose I mean one in the very highest category of objectives to be sought and achieved. The possibility of atomic war must be squarely faced and prepared for, since it is plain that if one party in the last analysis is willing to fight and the other is not, the will of the former will prevail. But so long as rationality controls conduct on both sides, it should be, and I think will be, directed to avoiding nuclear war and acts that lead to such a war.

—*From* A Democrat Looks at His Party, *by Dean Acheson. Harper & Brothers, 1955. Used by permission.*

Importance of Awareness

Christians must remind the nation that we are today involved in a social revolution and that all our thinking about our responsibility in the world must take cognizance of that fact. God is at work in this revolution. It is partly a manifestation of his judgment upon exploitation, injustice, and imperialism; it is also an opportunity for the development of a more just social and economic order. Only as we understand what this means

will we be able to act wisely. Our position of comfort and abundance does not prepare us for this task. For this reason, perhaps, there are few points at which we have failed more miserably in international affairs or at which our failure has had more tragic consequences. The people across the world who are caught in this social revolution and see the dimensions of it are more and more convinced that we cannot understand their situation. They have concluded that as we look out over the world, we tend to see only one problem—Communism—and think that we have only one mission—that of destroying it. They see Revolution and not Communism as the central problem. They face hunger and insecurity, and have rebelled against the injustices which they find unbearable. They realize that the old structures of their social, economic, and political life are inadequate. Stopping Communism will not solve these problems; it merely gives these nations time in which to find other answers. And if such solutions do not soon emerge, Communism, boring from within, may take over despite all our efforts to thwart Chinese and Russian expansion.

If we wish to maintain the respect of the free peoples of the world or be worthy of the position of leadership we now occupy, we will have to think in those terms. We must see clearly that any action aimed at stopping Communism can be only a first step, the effectiveness of which will depend upon our willingness to go further and to help provide an answer to the problems that Communism exploits in order to rise to power.

To use a figure of Stringfellow Barr, when we forget this fact we put the despairing masses of the world in the position of a very sick man who is confronted by two doctors. One of them offers him a pill, a Red one, which is widely advertised as the only cure for the disease that threatens to kill him. The other doctor looks, not at the dying man, but at his rival, and shouts: "Don't trust that man. He's a quack." Unless we realize that the patient is desperately sick, diagnose his illness properly, and offer him a more effective remedy, we can hardly hope that he will respect us as his doctor, nor can we easily keep him from taking the Red pill.

•

One of the strange ironies of our time is the fact that few events in recent years have done more to strengthen the Communist appeal in non-Communist countries than certain efforts in America to fight Communism at home. Many people in other lands see such movements for what they all too often are: either naïve attempts to meet a real problem, carried out by people of good intentions but with no awareness of the total world situation, or else diabolical efforts of the most reactionary forces to exploit a popular issue, not primarily for the purpose of removing the danger of Communist infiltration, but for their own ends of destroying all thought and leadership which might not conform with their views.

In the face of this danger, the Christian prophetic voice must be clear and severe. The Christian will see the Communist threat of sub-

version in America for what it is and will meet it with the proper means. But he will expose and decry all attempts to exploit that threat for less worthy ends, and he will strive to create the climate which will make better understanding of the world revolution possible. This will mean creative Christian leadership in all the media of mass communication as well as in schools and universities. It implies, above all else, the encouragement, within the Christian community itself, of this climate of understanding and study in which it will be possible to see what God is up to in the world. Recently a group of Brazilian pastors were engaged in an informal discussion with a visiting pastor from America. One of the first questions they asked him was: "What is the attitude of your church in the States to McCarthyism?" The pastor replied: "A lot of people in our church are in favor of him; many are opposed to him, but their attitude for or against him is based upon social and political, rather than religious grounds."

If what we have been saying about the Christian perspective is true, this attitude is wrong. The God of Christian faith is the God of politics and of international affairs. Political problems are theological problems, and international relations is one of the most important areas of Christian obedience in our time. If the Church hopes to fulfill its prophetic function, it will have to expose all efforts to blind Americans to the reality of God's activity in the present world, and expose them with the same vigor and courage with which the prophets of Israel denounced the false prophets who tried to do the same thing to the Jewish people of their time. Regardless of how dangerous this may be for the Christian, he will do it courageously and humbly, knowing that he is on the side of those forces which are at work in the world and will determine its future.

—*From* Encounter with Revolution, *by M. Richard Shaull. Association Press, 1955. Used by permission.*

IV

Ethical Implications

THERE ARE some who believe that moral considerations ought not to influence the foreign policy of a nation, that moral considerations are all right for the individual but not for the collective unity. Corporate bodies, it is argued, should be directed only by material considerations. . . .

It is, indeed, generally the case that those who represent a government operate only for the immediate and direct self-interest of the nation they represent. That is why suspicion generally attaches to governmental grants. It is assumed that governments do not give away their taxpayers' money unless they see some specific *quid pro quo*.

The Government of the United States has, I like to believe, a rather unique tradition in this respect. Our nation was founded as an experiment in human liberty. Our institutions reflect the belief of our founders that all men were endowed by their Creator with inalienable rights and had duties prescribed by moral law. They believed that human institutions ought primarily to help men develop their God-given possibilities and that our nation, by its conduct and example, could help men everywhere to find the way to a better and more abundant life.

Our nation realized that vision. There developed here an area of spiritual and economic vigor the like of which the world had never seen. It was no exclusive preserve; indeed, world mission was a central theme. Millions were welcomed from other lands, to share equally the opportunities of the founders and their heirs. We put our experiment on public exhibition so that all might see and follow if they would. Through the establishment of schools and hospitals, often under religious auspices, American ideals were carried throughout the world. We gave aid and comfort to those elsewhere who sought to follow in our way and to develop for themselves societies of greater human freedom.

These conditions prevailed for one hundred years and more. Then, as our material power waxed our spiritual power seemed to wane. We appeared to be less concerned with conducting a great experiment for the benefit of mankind and to be more concerned with piling up for ourselves material advantages. Our

vision seemed to contract, and our sense of mission to lessen.

We had to meet the severest test that can come to a people, the test of prosperity.

It was said by Jesus that material things will be added unto those who seek first the Kingdom of God and his righteousness. But when that happens, then comes the great trial. For, as Jesus warned, those material things can readily become the rust that corrodes men's souls.

Thus there is a familiar pattern. Men who feel a sense of duty to some higher Being strive here to do his will. Because of their faith, they have power and virtue and simple wisdom. They build not only for the day, but for the morrow; not merely for themselves, but for mankind. A society so founded will, when nature favors, produce wealth and luxury for many. When those by-products come, they seem so good that they become promoted to be the all-sufficient end.

So there came a time when our people were drawn away from long-range creative effort and when they struggled to get and to hold material things. Practices originally designed to reflect a faith may not have been adequately vitalized by continuing faith. I believe, however, that it can fairly be said that, since the end of World War II, our nation has recaptured the faith in which it was founded and has resumed works such as those which in the past were called "the Great American Experiment."

—*From* Principles in Foreign Policy, *by John Foster Dulles. The Department of State, 1955. Used by permission.*

"We Know in Part"

So I come again to the importance of the principle of self-limitation. I believe it was Goethe who said that to recognize one's own limits is the beginning of freedom. There is more to it than that, however. We must recognize as a nation also the necessity of fulfilling our limits, for as William James said, it is "when we touch our own upper limit and live in our own highest center of energy" that "we may call ourselves saved." Learning these two aspects of the principle of limitation is a lesson which nations, like individuals, must learn in becoming mature.

One of the briefest and clearest accounts of what it means to grow up is that given by the apostle Paul in his First Epistle to the Corinthians.

In early years Paul had been identified with a movement dedicated to the idea of realizing a perfect political solution by the establishment of an earthly kingdom fully reflecting the divine will. Then he had come under the influence of other ideas reflecting Hellenistic concepts in their acceptance of the contingent and imperfect nature of historical experience and the inherent ironic character of life. After hard inner

struggle, Paul shifted his viewpoint basically in an experience tremendously moving and climactic to the young man himself.

Later, looking back upon the ideas of his younger years, Paul described himself as then having spoken, understood, and reasoned as a child. In his account the great change had come with finding out that in historical experience one could see around and ahead only refractorily at best—"through a glass, darkly" or, as the Greek put it, "in a riddle." In the words of the epistle, "we know in part," with completeness in knowing and understanding beyond human reach and beyond the scope of history. The learning of this lesson Paul referred to as becoming a man and putting away childish things.

Along with this lesson Paul learned also the meaning of that triad of qualities identified as faith, hope, and charity. The first stands for one's sense of the existence—even though imperfectly perceived—of a meaning of life paramount over and antecedent to one's subjective understanding. The second represents the expectation of some fulfillment transcending one's momentary incapacity to see and to define it in advance. The third represents that compassionate view of other entities and institutions derived from one's knowledge of not having the final answers and one's recognition of all others as being in the same boat.

Paul called the third, the compassionate quality, the greatest of the three. Let us keep well in mind its paramountcy. It is the quality distinguishing us from our adversary, and we must guard it well. The adversary relies on a system. It contains the elements of faith and hope. Being a system, developed in pretense of having the total answer and in disregard of the inherent limits of all human endeavor and all human wisdom, it forecloses him from compassion.

—*From* The Limits of Foreign Policy, *by Charles Burton Marshall. Henry Holt and Company, 1954. Used by permission.*

The Lesser Evil

Neither science nor ethics nor politics can resolve the conflict between politics and ethics into harmony. We have no choice between power and the common good. To act successfully, that is, according to the rules of the political art, is political wisdom. To know with despair that the political act is inevitably evil, and to act nevertheless, is moral courage. To choose among several expedient actions the least evil one is moral judgment. In the combination of political wisdom, moral courage, and moral judgment, man reconciles his political nature with his moral destiny. That this conciliation is nothing more than a *modus vivendi*, uneasy, precarious, and even paradoxical, can disappoint only those who prefer to gloss over and to distort the tragic contradictions of human existence with the soothing logic of a specious concord.

—*From* Scientific Man vs. Power Politics, *by Hans J. Morgenthau. The University of Chicago Press, 1946. Used by permission.*

For the vision is not of this world but of another and radically different one. The apostles, as a matter of fact, believed themselves to be living in the last days of the world, and they made no provision for a systematic and definitive record of the sacred deposit. But even if they had not believed that the end of the existing world was near, it would still be true that what they taught is not addressed to this world but to a very different one.

There is, for example, the precept that we should love our enemies. It has troubled the doctors of the Church as it has the common man. Aquinas remarks that the good do not bear with the wicked to the extent of enduring the injuries done to God and their neighbors; St. Chrysostom says that "it is praiseworthy to be patient under one's own wrongs, but the height of impiety to dissemble injuries done to God."

The saying disintegrates when we attempt to treat it as a specific rule of political conduct. What, then, is its wisdom? It is not the wisdom of the public world and of how to govern it. It is the wisdom of the economy of our passions, and of their education and their ordering. It does not give the rules of behavior in the actual world. It sets before men a vision of themselves transformed. . . .

Knowledge of the other realm is not communicable in the prosaic language of the familiar material world. For it comes from a vision of a world which is not to be perceived by our senses. The language of the seers cannot be direct statements of propositions. They must speak in poetic parable and metaphor which intimates and may evoke that which is inexpressible in prose. These parables and metaphors are addressed not to the government of men, but, in the language of Saint Paul, to the creation of the new man. Who is this new man? In the famous chapter of Galatians [Gal. 3: 22-24], Paul explains that the Scripture, meaning the law and the prophets of the Old Testament, "hath concluded all under sin." They are addressed to unregenerate men, to men as they are in the world, to the sons of Adam and Eve who have suffered what Aquinas called a "wounding of nature." In them "reason" has lost "its perfect hold over the lower parts of the soul."

"The law," says Saint Paul, "was our schoolmaster." It corrected our ignorance, malice, weakness, and lust. But after the faith in Christ is come, "we are no longer under a schoolmaster." When our passions are transformed by allegiance to the other realm of being, we do not need to be disciplined. The regenerate man, says Saint Paul, is not conformed to this world, but is transformed in the renewing of his mind [Rom. 12: 2]. . . . [Such men] can, as Confucius said, follow what their hearts desire without transgressing what is right.

—*From* Essays in the Public Philosophy, *by Walter Lippmann. Little, Brown and Company and Atlantic Monthly Press, 1955. Used by permission.*

V

World Government — Pro and Con

PEACE cannot be achieved by a syllogism which is based on fantastic premises, discredited by elementary political science years ago. The prophets of World Government Now have been getting away with their sleight of hand by effectively concealing three Grand Errors. The first of these is the error commonly made by neophyte students of political science: that you can pass a law to stop almost everything, including sin. This view stems from a topsy-turvy misconception of the way governments are made. Reduced to its barest elements, the chain of distortion takes the following path: Constitutions establish governments. Governments, in turn, pass laws to stop people from fighting each other and to persuade them to settle their differences in friendly fashion. Resultant law and order encourage people to co-operate and live as one big, universal, happy family. Nothing could be more absurd. Except for short periods under dictatorship the process is exactly reverse. Through common living and common loyalties a community forms, establishing common habits and rules of behavior. It is out of this *social* order that political authority and government arise. Constitution-making is the last step.

Error number two may be labeled the devil theory of sovereignty. This assumes that if you do away with the right of sovereign states to wage war, by delegating that right to a "higher sovereignty," you do away with war. The shadow of sovereignty is mistaken for the reality of power. For, as the history of civil strife demonstrates, the . . . right to make war is hardly a prerequisite of battle.

Closely related is the third major error, that war is a lawsuit fought with bombs instead of briefs. World government, it is argued, will establish effective tribunals for the settlement of "disputes" which lead to war. But war is rarely so much a dispute over justice as a conflict of interests. War, like politics, is an attempt to determine by pressure who gets what, where, when; it is an attempt to change the *status quo.*

—*Nathan A. Pelcovits, from* Harper's Magazine, *November, 1946. Reprinted in* Readings in World Politics, *Vol. III, American Foundation for Political Education, 1953. Used by permission.*

"If the Occasion Is Ripe"

World government sounds like a fine idea to many people. Why not adopt it, the sooner the better? they ask. Some American citizens are daily pressuring the statesmen to come out unequivocally for a plan of world federation.

Desirable as proposals for world government may seem, under present and now foreseeable conditions, any world government would be a tyranny —a far cry from the representative, democratic world government so neatly elaborated on paper.

Democratic, representative, and responsible governments exist successfully only where there is a sense of community, considerable homogeneity, and some solid agreement on the ends of society. In particular, there must be a consensus on the custom and law to be enforced, so that the rules of the game are understood and accepted. To push political boundaries beyond the limits of such consensus is to court tyranny, for then to have even a minimum of order, one part of the community must impose its law upon the other part. Assuming today a world government, with a world legislature, a world court, and a world executive, what system of justice would prevail? Would it be the Soviet or the American system, the Indian or Yugoslav system? Since there is not now or in prospect general world agreement on an acceptable system, one national system would have to be imposed.

If one section of the world were being forced against its will to submit to an alien law, the world government would be a tyranny. Certainly, we would want nothing to do with a world government in which there was the slightest chance that the Soviet system of justice would be enforced. Nor would we want to become tangled up in a world government in which we found ourselves in a position of trying to impose our own system of justice on the Russians, not to mention the great mass of Asians, Middle Easterners, and Africans. Our initially democratic system, once it had gone through such a process, far from being democratic any longer would be unrecognizable and something we ourselves would want to disown.

If one section of the world were being coerced contrary to its will to submit to an alien law, the world government not only would be a tyranny, but would be an unstable one at that, with civil wars between great units of the world a constant likelihood. Unless and until there is a consensus on the custom and law to be enforced, at least between the major units of the world, any world government promises not to be the permanent fixture its devotees declare, but unstable and impermanent, shortly giving way to other forms of order in the world, less ambitious perhaps, but more efficient in keeping a tolerable order.

World government may sometime turn out to be possible and desirable. It is still too soon to be sure, for certain conditions must be fulfilled before world government would be a good thing. Unless and until they are fulfilled, no responsible statesman can commit his nation to world government, no matter how fine and upstanding a proposal sounds. It is one thing for some individual citizens to advocate world government, and certainly the exploration of the implica-

tions and possibilities of world government should be our continuing concern. But it is something else again to commit this country officially, and set in motion the entire weight of this nation, on behalf of an idea that could not under present circumstances actually set us forward. . . .

Particularly unhelpful is the insistence by some advocates of world government that anything less than world government, by way of organizing the common life of nations, is now no good at all. To use the idea of world government to undermine, frustrate, and weaken current co-operative efforts is absurd. To hold present alliances and coalitions, as well as actual international organizations, up to ridicule, in the name of some paper utopia, does not advance matters. One rejoices to see supporters of world government, like Mortimer Adler, increasingly recognize that in any event no world government is possible without many years of effort and difficulty.

—*From* Common Sense and World Affairs, *copyright, 1955, by Dorothy Fosdick. Reprinted by permission of Harcourt, Brace and Company, Inc.*

There Is a Way

The problem of peace is a social and political problem, not technical.

War is never the disease itself. War is a reaction to a disease of society, the symptom of disease. It is just like fever in the human body. We shall never be able to prevent all wars in advance, because it is impossible to foresee future differentiations of human society, exactly where divisions and splits of society will take place. In the twenty-fifth century perhaps the great conflict will be between the orange growers and the believers in Taoism. We do not know.

What we do know is that war is the result of contact between non-integrated sovereign units, whether such units be families, tribes, villages, estates, cities, provinces, dynasties, religions, classes, nations, regions, or continents.

We also know that today, the conflict is between the scattered units of nation-states. During the past hundred years, all major wars have been waged between nations. This division among men is the only condition which, in our age, can create—and undoubtedly will create—other wars.

The task therefore is to prevent wars between the nations—international wars.

Logical thinking and historical empiricism agree that there *is* a way to solve this problem and prevent wars between the nations once and for all. But with equal clarity they also reveal that there is *one* way and one way alone to achieve this end: the integration of the scattered conflicting national sovereignties into one unified, higher sovereignty, capable of creating a legal order within which all peoples may enjoy equal security, equal obligations, and equal rights under law.

—*From* The Anatomy of Peace, *by Emery Reves. Harper & Brothers, 1945. Used by permission.*

VI

What Can You Do?

To do the good that is straight under your nose is vigilance.

Individual citizens can put themselves sympathetically into the situation of the responsible government official. When people outside the government argue that the President and Secretary of State made a bad decision, and then suggest what should have been done, they usually do not realize that the proposal they favor had occurred to officials but had been rejected. A basic difference between officials making policy and citizens stating their preferences is that official decisions commit the prestige, material resources, and man power of America to a course of *action,* while the opinions of an individual citizen set off no such momentous train of events. Officials cannot write their private preferences into state papers. . . .

We can refrain from substituting vituperation for debate, denunciation for evidence. Important as it is to identify and examine both *past* and *current* mistakes we should be able to do this without wholesale condemnation of either the patriotism or the integrity of the officials concerned.

Thucydides described the deep trouble in Athens after its long ordeal of war: "Society became divided into camps in which no man trusted his fellow." Too many of us have reached the stage where we can no longer rationally communicate with one another. Instead of talking about the facts, sharing our different points of view, and reasoning together, we are apt to consume our energy in calling each other names, making charges, and striking out at someone. Many of us are like the Senator in the cartoon saying: "This speech you whipped out for me, Sneedby, deals with facts! Surely we're not that devoid of issues!"

For the conduct of foreign policy, we have to rely on the President and his advisers, working with the advice and consent of the Senate. But the public has its part to play also—above all, to discuss and debate policies *on their merits.* Official assumptions and estimates are never above reproach and so beyond criticism. Officials may propose unwise policies, act imprudently, or fail to act when they should act. It is appropriate and necessary for citizens to ask questions, raise doubts, and,

where they believe it is needed, urge reappraisal, thereby encouraging officials to follow the truth of matters. No one of us can perform this function, however, if instead of following the truth ourselves, we are engaged in recrimination. . . .

The wisdom of a policy bears no direct relation to the number of people favoring it. The great majority of Americans wanted to "bring the boys home" after World War II, but as things turned out this move was unwise. Shortly we were rushing the boys back to Europe to bulwark the common defense. While many Americans want to withdraw from the United Nations should the Communist Chinese Government be seated over our protests, it does not follow that such a move would be sensible. To leave the United Nations without the rallying point of American leadership might well change that organization . . . into being continually a menace—a United Nations in which Peking had the veto and Washington not even a voice. Should a *majority* of Americans favor cutting our commitments abroad and attempting to retire to a fortress in this hemisphere, such a policy would not thereby be sound. Even if 95 per cent of the people favor a given line, still it may not be the best available one.

Some of us are tempted to argue that without access to "classified information" we cannot be expected to reach adequate decisions—that it is all right to plead for understanding, but that since the layman lacks sufficient facts wise judgments are precluded. If each of us read *The New York Times* regularly we would have enough information to go on. . . .

We can do the little good close at hand. What each of us accomplishes in just ordinary situations may have important repercussions on foreign policy.

The restaurant operator in South Carolina who threw a dark-skinned customer and his family out of his restaurant one night did not realize how disastrous the results would be. He did not anticipate that by humiliating this man and his children, he was preparing his conversion to Communism. Returning to his South American homeland that man is now a leader of the Communist party, and he attributes his new faith to the night in South Carolina.

The American professor who befriended a lonely and disillusioned Japanese student visiting in this country did not foresee what was in store. He had no idea that out of that friendship would grow an abiding faith in the best of this country, so that when that Japanese student became president of a great Japanese university he would devote himself to cultivating the common interests of Japan and America. . . .

What any one of us does in his own small corner of the world, joined with the accomplishments of others, can have unexpected, weighty effects. If we wait until we can have some perceptible, decisive influence on national policy in Washington, D.C., innumerable worth-while opportunities right near at home will slip by us.

—*From* Common Sense and World Affairs, *copyright, 1955, by Dorothy Fosdick. Reprinted by permission of Harcourt, Brace and Company, Inc.*

VII World Order in Your Church — How to Get Started

An Opinion Poll

Most world affairs discussions have concentrated on the lecture-forum type of presentation, or depended upon the use of such mass media as film, radio, television. The really effective job of education for responsibility in world affairs takes place in small group discussion, and the casual, informal conversations that people can have in social groups, in family gatherings, with neighbors and associates on their jobs. Conducting an opinion poll among the members of a church or in the community involves small groups of people in action-research.

By means of an opinion poll, investigate the prevailing attitudes in your community about the United Nations. From a display of clippings from daily newspapers (news, as well as editorial comment), consider the influence of the press on public opinion. Ask a subcommittee of the study group to prepare a short opinion test to be used in various meetings of church groups. Do the prevailing attitudes of the congregation differ from those of the community? Summarize and report findings in the study group, or in a church family-night dinner meeting.

An International Dinner

In family-night programs, where members of the congregation may gather for fellowship and general sociability, people not deeply interested in international relations can be exposed to the importance of world events and the meaning of these events for their lives.

A church family-night dinner with the UN theme can be a colorful and fascinating event. UN flags and posters may decorate the dining room, small paper flags of the 76 member nations of the UN may be place cards. The dishes to be served may be prepared from the UN cookbook noting one hundred of the world's most famous recipes. Copies of the cookbook could be sold following the dinner to members of the congregation.

Foreign students, visitors from abroad, refugee or escapee families could be special guests. There is much to be said for cultivating foreign visitors and helping them to share and know more intimately American church life.

Brochures describing the specialized agencies of the United Nations and its principal organs can be attractive table decorations. The planning committee can word five or six questions relating to the poster display and have these questions mimeographed, and as the guests assemble ask them to find the answers by studying the posters on the dining room walls.

This church family night can be the occasion for announcing the results of an opinion

poll of church members conducted by the study group; also for discussing the World Council's nine essential principles for an international ethos and the denominational statements on peace and international affairs. Many international organizations have local chapters and are very willing to participate in church discussions and contribute leadership for panels and speaking engagements. A member of the local World Affairs Council, for example, could evaluate the comparative study of foreign policy and the World Council's principles for peace. Time should be allocated in the general program for small group sessions where there can be exchange of opinion and free discussion. Too many "international" programs feature big-name speakers and short question periods where there is little chance for exchanging views. Here the program will be enormously enlivened and strengthened if there are dissenting views and opinions and objections.

An Appraisal of Foreign Policy

Here is another program device for a study . . . on international affairs.

Look up the meaning of "ethos" and discuss this intriguing word at the opening of the session. [See p. 11.]

Then on a large blackboard or broad sheet of wrapping paper draw *three columns*, each wide enough to permit a good deal of writing. Before the group assembles, the group leader and interested group members do some important research. In *column 1* they outline the nine points proposed by the World Council of Churches as essential principles in international affairs. In *column 2* are listed recent pronouncements or social declarations of your denomination on world order and international affairs. In *column 3* list plans or points of strategy in our present American foreign policy. The reports from the Evanston meetings of the World Council of Churches have their parallel in the statements and pronouncements of the various denominations. These statements are intended to guide individual Christians, churches, and church-related agencies in their witness and influence in economic, social, and political life. Recent pronouncements may be secured . . . and distributed or mailed to each group member. Sections of these statements dealing with international affairs should be carefully read in preparation for this session.

In assembling data for the third column, assign several members of the group to review current magazines and local newspapers, noting news items, editorials, opinions of various news commentators and columnists.

Check points of agreement; star points of disparity in the three columns. Below the columns note questions for general discussion.

Give special emphasis to aspects of foreign policy that may or may not square with the principles suggested for a Christian international ethos. For example, do present policies of the Western powers toward the U.S.S.R. and Red China, or toward France, square with points 7, 8, and 9 in the World Council statement?

What is inconsistent about affirming "the responsibility of Christians to be peacemakers and work to build a world of justice and accord," and electing Senators who will vote consistently against trade agreements, the admission of refugees, and appropriations for the United Nations?

It may be possible to use available resource persons in the community. History teachers, political scientists, experts in international affairs, foreign students, refugees, foreign-born wives of servicemen may be helpful in exploring this subject as resource persons.

Many groups will want to study the voting records of recent sessions of Congress in relation to the nine essentials of peace, and ask themselves these questions: What guidance have we as church members given to our Senators and Representatives in international matters? What other factors influence them in formulating public policies?

Study to Action

As a result of this [study], the group may wish (1) to urge local radio stations to broadcast (more) UN programs, (2) to encourage local newspapers to give better (fairer) coverage of UN activities, (3) to write thoughtful letters to government leaders about current issues in foreign affairs, (4) to help initiate (or strengthen) school programs and teaching about international relations, (5) to urge the denomination to adopt appropriate resolutions on international issues, (6) to evaluate church school teaching and study materials in terms of our Christian concern for world peace and order.

What are some other activities by which the group may take part, even a small part, in "the struggle for world community"?

Church groups can be a powerful force in international education. . . . This [study] and the follow-up activities which will result from it should make group members more eager to be informed and responsible Christian citizens. One of the most important steps in this process is to provide an opportunity for real exchange of views and attitudes. Critics and dissenters should be encouraged to participate. They will stimulate interest and enliven the discussion. Basically, greater education takes place when there are perceived differences, rather than complete agreement.

—*From* Every Church and Evanston, *A Study Guide Based on Evanston Speaks. Published by the National Council of Churches. Used by permission.*

Quantity Rates

Single Issue Orders

Single copy	15 cents
5—10 copies	10 cents each
11—24 copies	8 cents each
25 or more copies	6 cents each

Group Subscriptions (to *one* address)

5—10 yearly subscriptions	80 cents each
11—100 yearly subscriptions	60 cents each

Club Subscriptions (to *separate* addresses)

5—10 yearly subscriptions	90 cents each
11—100 yearly subscriptions	75 cents each

Allow 2 months for new subscriptions

A new SOCIAL PROGRESS *feature*

Each month we will suggest timely topics which can be treated in a variety of ways in your church's regular program—

- pulpit announcements
- items for church bulletins and newsletters
- quickie reports at monthly women's meetings
- discussions with elders and deacons
- Bible study and the church's work with families in the church school

THE ANNOUNCER

The upsurge of good will among the peoples of the world is a massive hope for all mankind. To brighten this hope among American Christians, many Presbyterian churches will be seeking to know and to do "the things that make for peace" through an all-Church peace emphasis in 1956 and 1957.

Study and action ideas are available for every group and every member of local congregations. This issue of SOCIAL PROGRESS is an essential resource for all study of world affairs. It should be especially helpful to the women of our churches, who will be inquiring into the work of the United Nations in circle meetings during 1957. Their circle study, Learning to Live and Work Together —The United Nations and Us, *will be off the press this spring. It will form the basis for five or more intensely interesting discussion sessions.*

Program leaders should watch for further announcement, then order supplies of the circle study and extra copies of SOCIAL PROGRESS (March, 1956) from your nearest Presbyterian Distribution Service:

156 Fifth Avenue, New York 10
71 East Lake Street, Chicago 1
234 McAllister Street, San Francisco 2